

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.		FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/017,568		12/14/2001	Michael B. Zemel	UTR-104C1	9941
26694	7590	07/13/2004		EXAM	INER
		JER, HOWARD AI	WEBMAN, EDWARD J		
	P.O. BOX 34385 WASHINGTON, DC 20043-9998				PAPER NUMBER
				1617	

DATE MAILED: 07/13/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NUMBER

FIUNG DATE

FIRST NAMED APPLICANT

ATTY, DOCKET NO.

EXAMINER PAPER NUMBER ART UNIT

DATE MAILED:

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application. COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

	OFFICE ACTION SUMMARY
Responsive to communication(s) filed on	4/1/04
☐ This action is FINAL.	
Since this application is in condition for allowar accordance with the practice under Ex parte O	nce except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in uayle, 1935 D.C. 11; 453 O.G. 213.
A shortened statutory period for response to this at whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this co the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 1.136(a).	month(s), or thirty days, mmunication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR
Disposition of Claims	
Claim(s) 21 - 27, 29, 3 Of the above, claim(s) Claim(s)	is/are pending in the application. is/are withdrawn from consideration. is/are allowed. is/are rejected.
Claim(s)	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
\bigcirc Claim(s) $21 - 27, 29, 35$	is/are objected to. are subject to restriction or election requirement.
Application Papers	
	is/are objected to by the Examinerisapproved disapproved. er.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	
Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTII	FIED copies of the priority documents have been
received. received in Application No. (Series Code/S received in this national stage application to	Gerial Number) from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
*Certified copies not received:	
Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domes	tic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).
Attachment(s)	
Notice of Reference Cited, PTO-892	
Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-144	9, Paper No(s)
☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413	
Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review	, PTO-948
Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152	
SEE OFF	ICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES

Application/Control Number: 10/017,568

Art Unit: 1617

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention: a method of treating obesity, a method of regulating body weight, a method of identifying an antagonist.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, methods are generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added.

An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Application/Control Number: 10/017,568

Art Unit: 1617

Claims 39, 42 (exemplary) are generic to a plurality of disclosed patentably distinct species comprising antagonists. Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species, even though this requirement is traversed.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Applicants must elect one ultimate antagonist. That is, the members of claims 39, 42 are to be considered as members of one Markush group.

If applicants elect a method of regulating body weight, as the following elections of species is required:

Claim 55 is generic to a plurality of disclosed patentably distinct species comprising calcitrophic hormone activity. Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species, even though this requirement is traversed.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the

Art Unit: 1617

inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Claim 56 is generic to a plurality of disclosed patentably distinct species comprising health problems. Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species, even though this requirement is traversed.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Claim 61 is generic to a plurality of disclosed patentably distinct species comprising antagonist activity. Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species, even though this requirement is traversed.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

If applicants elect a method of identifying an antagonist, the following election of species is required:

Application/Control Number: 10/017,568

Art Unit: 1617

Claims 70, 71 are generic to a plurality of disclosed patentably distinct species comprising calcitrophic hormone activity. Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species, even though this requirement is traversed.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Edward J. Webman at telephone number 571-272-0633.

Webman/tgd

June 15, 2004

EDWAPO J. WEBMAN PRIMANAY EXAMINER GNOUP 1500